



1       1. *E-mail correspondence regarding PSS' teaching positions.*

2       **Objections:**

- 3           a.       Lack of foundation.  
4           b.       Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.

5       2. *Letter of Concern dated October 6, 2004.*

6       **Objections:**

- 7           a.       Lack of foundation.  
8           b.       Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under 402.  
9           c.       Any relevancy is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion or  
10           misleading the jury pursuant to Rule 403.  
11           d.       Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.  
12           e.       Impermissible character evidence regarding witness Elisabeth Nepaial  
13           pursuant to 404(b).

14       3. *Report by Dr. Edward Dragan.*

15       **Objections:**

- 16           a.       Lack of foundation.  
17           b.       Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.  
18           c.       Any relevancy is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion or  
19           misleading the jury pursuant to Rule 403.  
20           d.       Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.  
21           e.       Expert testimony that does not meet the requirements of Rule 702.

22       4. *Report by Larry Hocog.*

23       **Objections:**

- 24           a.       Lack of foundation.  
25           b.       Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.  
26           c.       Any relevancy is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion or  
27           misleading the jury pursuant to Rule 403.  
28           d.       Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.  
            e.       Expert testimony that does not meet the requirements of Rule 702.

          5. *Report of Roger Slater.*

- a. Lack of foundation.
- b. Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.
- c. Any relevancy is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion or misleading the jury pursuant to Rule 403.
- d. Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.
- e. Expert testimony that does not meet the requirements of Rule 702.

6. *Statistical Analysis of teacher qualifications by PSS and student performance at Hopwood.*

**Objections:**

- a. Lack of foundation.
- b. Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.
- c. Any relevancy is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion or misleading the jury pursuant to Rule 403.
- d. Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.

7. *Emails from Jim Brewer to Austin Briggs and Brad Latzke.*

**Objections:**

- a. Lack of foundation.
- b. This exhibit is incomplete and thus inadmissible unless the remainder of the e-mail is introduced pursuant to Rule 106.

8. *Notice of Personnel Action.*

**Objections:**

- a. Lack of foundation.
- b. This exhibit is incomplete and thus inadmissible unless the remainder of the document is introduced pursuant to Rule 106.

9. *Letters of Recommendation.*

**Objections:**

- a. Lack of foundation.
- b. Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.
- c. Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.

1  
2 *10. Correspondence regarding disputes between Lisa Black, Rory Starky and Katherine*  
3 *Barja.*

4 **Objections:**

- 5 a. Lack of foundation.  
6 b. Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.

7 *11. Evaluations of Plaintiff.*

8 **Objections:**

- 9 a. Lack of foundation.

10 *12. Correspondence regarding propriety of evaluations of Plaintiff.*

11 **Objections:**

- 12 a. Lack of foundation.  
13 b. Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.  
14 c. Any relevancy is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion or  
15 misleading the jury pursuant to Rule 403.  
16 d. Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.

17 *13. Correspondence regarding letters of concern and formal reprimands.*

18 **Objections by page number:**

- 19 a. Page 408-409: lack of foundation; hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus  
20 inadmissible under Rule 802.  
21 b. Page 413: no objection  
22 c. Page 418: lack of foundation; hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus  
23 inadmissible under Rule 802.  
24 d. Page 455: no objection  
25 e. Page 444: no objection  
26  
27  
28

f. Page 443: no objection

g. Page 419: same document as p. 443– no objection

*14. Correspondence regarding investigation of letter of concern.*

**Objections:**

- a. Lack of foundation.
- b. Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.
- c. Any relevancy is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion or misleading the jury pursuant to Rule 403.
- d. Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.
- e. Impermissible character evidence pursuant to Rule 404(b).

*15. Various newspaper articles reporting on the letter of concern.*

**Objections:**

- a. Lack of foundation.
- b. Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.
- c. Any relevancy is outweighed by the danger of unfair prejudice, confusion or misleading the jury pursuant to Rule 403.
- d. Hearsay pursuant to Rule 801 and thus inadmissible under Rule 802.
- e. Impermissible character evidence pursuant to Rule 404(b).

*16. Photographs of Hopwood.*

**Objections:**

- a. No copy provided to Defendant PSS.
- b. Lack of foundation.
- c. Irrelevant under Rule 401 and thus inadmissible under Rule 402.

Respectfully submitted by:

\_\_\_\_\_/s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Heather L. Kennedy F0246  
Attorney for the Public School System